

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12172.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 539 of 1978

between

SHRI AMAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HYDERABAD
ASBESTOS CEMENT PRODUCTS LTD., BALLABGARH

Present.—

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri O. P. Sethi, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/107-78/54023, dated 29th November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Amar Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Amar Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri O. P. Sethi as M. W. 1 and closed their case on issue No. 1 and 5. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. But on the date fixed the representative for the management stated that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties. The settlement is Ex. M. 1. According to the settlement the workman received a sum of Rs. 13,500 from the management in full and final settlement forgoing his right of reinstatement and re-employment. The representative for the workman also agreed to it.

In view of the statements given by the parties and as per settlement Ex. M. 1, I give my award that the workman has settled the dispute with the management and has received a sum of Rs. 13,500 from the management in full and final settlement of his accounts forgoing his right of reinstatement and re-employment.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated, the 29th October, 1980.

Presiding Officer, Industrial
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 999, dated 31st October, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8 Lab./12174.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s D. G. L. Pvt., Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 354 of 1978

between

THE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S D. G. L. PVT., LTD., 6, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri K. L. Sharma, for the workman.

Shri Y. H. Diwan, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/92-78/38248, dated 18th August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s D. G. L. Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

- (1) Whether the closure declared by the management on 12th May, 1978, is justified, and in order ? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Sarvshri Harbans Lal, Mohan Lal, Subhash Chander and K. K. Baijal is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workmen filed their claim statement but the management did not file any written statement even after repeated opportunities. Their case was closed and *ex parte* evidence of the workmen was recorded. On the last date of hearing the workmen or their representative was not present. The factory stands closed since long. Shri Mohan Lal, workman, appeared as WM-1 and stated that he was working in this concern with effect from 9th August, 1966 at Rs 490, per mensem. His services were terminated on 10th May, 1978. Shri Subhash Chander workman appeared as WW-2 and stated that he was working since 7th November, 1970 at Rs 468 per mensem. His services were terminated on 10th May, 1978. He further stated that the factory was closed with effect from 12th December, 1978. Sarvshri Harbans Lal and K. K. Baijal did not appear in witness box. Hence Shri Harbans Lal and K. K. Baijal are not entitled to any relief.

Believing *ex parte* statements of Shri Mohan Lal and Subhash Chander both these workmen are entitled to reinstatement with all benefits of service up to the closure of the factory.

Dated the 30th October, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 997, dated the 31st October, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 28th November, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12186.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Executive Engineer, Mechanical Division, P.W.D., B. & R. Division, Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK
Reference No. 184 of 1980

between
SHRI BALAK RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT, OF M/S EXECUTIVE
ENGINEER, MECHANICAL DIVISION, P.W.D., B. & R. DIVISION, ROHTAK

Present—

Shri Balak Ram, workman, in person.
Shri V. C. Jain, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 184 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor, — vide his order No. ID/RTK/89-80/44434, dated 19th August, 1980, under section 10(1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Balak Ram, workman and the management of M/s Executive Engineer, Mechanical Division, P.W.D., B. & R., Rohtak. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Balak Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference, notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared in response to the same on 3rd October, 1980 and arrived at a mutual amicable settlement. The statement of the workman was recorded as under :—

"I have been reinstated by the management with effect from 1st September, 1980, with continuity of service. The intervening period shall be treated as leave without pay. Award may be made accordingly."

In view of his statement award is made accordingly while returning the reference in these terms. No order as to costs.

Dated the 20th October, 1980.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2640, dated 1st November, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12192.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Roadways, Jind.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT
HARYANA ROHTAK.

Reference No 181 of 1979

between

SHRI HOSHIAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA
ROADWAYS, JIND

Present—

Shri S. N. Vats, along with workman.
Shri A. R. Goyal, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 181 of 1979 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/KNL/32-79/41342, dated 20th September, 1979, under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Hoshiar Singh, workman and the management of M/s Haryana Roadways, Jind. The term of reference was:—

Whether the termination of the services of Shri Hoshia: Singh was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were sent to the parties. The parties put in their appearance, filed their respective pleadings and issue as per reference was framed. One witness of the management was examined on 4th June, 1980, the second was examined on 1st August, 1980 and the evidence of the management was closed on the same day. After obtaining two adjournments for the evidence of the workman the case was fixed for settlement and on 10th October, 1980, a settlement was arrived at between the parties. The statement of the workman was recorded as under:—

"The management has reinstated me as helper,—*vide* order Exhibit M-1. The intervening period from 8th December, 1978 to 15th September, 1980, shall be treated as leave extraordinary and will not be counted towards leave and increment. Award may be made accordingly."

In view of his statement the award is made in term of Exhibit M-1 filed by the management by which the workman is reinstated as helper and intervening period was to be treated as

leave extraordinary which will not be counted towards leave and increment. I, therefore, answer the reference while returning the same in these terms. No order as to costs.

Dated the 20th October, 1980

PANWARI LAL DALAL

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 2646, dated 11th November, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/12272.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Progressive Packaging Industries, NIT Faridabad.—

**BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 334 of 1978

between

**SHRI S. K. KOCHI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PROGRESSIVE
PACKAGING INDUSTRIES, NIT FARIDABAD**

Present—

Shri R. L. Sharma, for the workman.

Shri A. J. S. Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/95-78/37817, dated 16th August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Progressive Packaging Industries, NIT Faridabad and its workman Shri S. K. Kochi, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri S. K. Kochi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 29th May, 1979:—

- (1) Whether the workman has lost his lien on his service by remaining absent?
- (2) Whether this court has no jurisdiction?
- (3) Whether the reference is bad in law?
- (4) Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri Damodar Parshad, Accountant, as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman who examined himself and closed his case. Arguments were heard. I now give my finding issueswise:—

*Issue No. 1 :—*MW-1 stated that the workman was doing the work of pasting of boxes. He was drawing wages @ Rs. 305 per mensem. He remained absent from 9th August, 1977 to 22nd August, 1977 and thereafter his name was not carried forward. He produced extract from attendance register Exhibit

M-1. Letter Exhibit M-2 was written to the workman which was received by him and he signed in town of its receipt at point 'A'. Another letter was written to him which is copy Exhibit M-3. It was received by the son of the workman who also worked in the factory. His son signed Exhibit M-3 at point 'B' in token of receipt. He further stated that the workman never informed the management about his absence, nor he applied for leave. In cross-examination he stated that Exhibit M-3 was delivered to the workman through some person. He could not say as to who delivered Exhibit M-3 to the son of the workman. He stated that the attendance register was in his hand and abstract M-1 was also prepared by him.

WW-1 stated that he joined the factory in 1972 at Rs. 150. He was removed from service due to absence. He was feeling unwell but the management wanted overtime work from him. He refused overtime so he was removed from service. No order was given to him in writing. In cross-examination he stated that after 10—12 days of his being unwell he received letter Exhibit M-2. He admitted his signatures at point 'A'. He admitted that his son was working with the management during the relevant period but he could not identify his signatures. They remained together in the factory for five years. Demand was raised by him after nine months because the management refused to pay him bonus and 8 days wages. He had no intention at that time to raise the dispute with the management.

I have gone through letter Exhibit M-2 which states that the workman was absenting from duty with effect from 9th August, 1977, without leave. This letter is dated 28th September, 1977. The workman has admitted receipt of this letter and his signatures on it. Thus conversely he himself proves Exhibit M-1 his period of absence. The workman has also stated that he had no intention to raise the present demand because he may be full aware of his conduct. In the circumstances, I decide this issue in favour of the management.

Due to adverse finding on issue No. 1, there remains no necessity to decide other issues.

While answering the reference, I give my award that the management did not terminate the services of the workman, rather on the other hand the workman lost his lien on the job by remaining absent from duty.

Dated the 3rd November, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1025, dated 4th November, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12273.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hyderabad Asbests Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 258 of 1979

between

SHRI NAND LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HYDERABAD
ASBESTOS CEMENT PRODUCTS LTD., BALLABGARH

Present—

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri O. P. Sethi, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. 35754, dated 17th August, 1979 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Hyderabad Asbestos Cement products Ltd., Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Nand Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of subsection (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(1) Whether the termination of services of Shri Nand Lal was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleading of the parties issues were framed on 20th February, 1980 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management, who examined Shri S. P. Mehta, their Labour Officer, as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. But on the date fixed, the representative stated that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and produced "settlement Exhibit M-1. He further stated that the workman has received a sum of Rs. 9600 from the management. Receipt is Exhibit M-2. The representative for the workman agreed to it.

In view of the statements given by the parties and as per settlement Exhibit M-1, I give my award that the workman has received a sum of Rs. 9600 from the management in full and final settlement foregoing his right of reinstatement and re-employment and any other claim if any due.

Dated, the 3rd November, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1023, dated the 4th November, 1980.

Forwarded, (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12608.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Malevel Castings Sector 24, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 30 of 1979

between

SHRI SHER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S MALEVEL CASTINGS, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present.—

None for the workman.

None for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 30 of 1979 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/44/79/49969, dated 26th November, 1979 under section 10 (1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Sher Singh workman and the management of M/s Malevel Castings, Sector-24, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Sher Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled to?"

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. Both the parties appeared and the management filed the written statement on 15th February 1980 and the case was fixed for 22nd February, 1980 for filing of rejoinder and framing of issues. On 22nd February, 1980 both

the parties prayed for a date for settlement which was granted and the case was fixed for 29th February, 1980. On that day neither the workman nor his authorised representative was present but the management was present. My Learned predecessor passed the *ex-parte* order against the workman and the same day the *ex-parte* evidence of the management was recorded. Shri V.P. Sharma, partner of the respondent management stated that the above said workman had left his service of his own accord and his other partner started his own foundry. This workman was employed by that partner. He further stated that his factory was closed since then and the award was reserved.

On 24th March, 1980 the representative of the workman filed an application for setting aside the *ex-parte* order which was set aside and the notice was sent to the management for 22nd May, 1980, but the service of the notice could not be effected on the management. Then the representative of the workman was directed to file the correct address of the respondent and the case was fixed for 9th July, 1980. On that day none was present from either side. The service of the notice could not be effected on the management as the employer was not available on that new address.

In these circumstances, I feel that the workman had settled his dispute with the management and joined his services in the foundry of other partner of the respondent Company as stated by Shri V.P. Sharma. The workman is not interested to pursuing his case. I send no dispute award in this reference. No order as to costs. This be read in answer of this award.

The 6th November, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2078, dated the 10th November, 1980.

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12611.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Malevel Castings, Sector 24, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 27 of 1979

between

SHRI OUMED SINGH LAMBA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S MALEVEL CASTINGS, SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

None for the workman.

None for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 27 of 1979 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/44/79/49951, dated 26th November, 1979, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Oumed Singh Lamba workman and the management of M/s Malevel Castings, Sector 24, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Oumed Singh Lamba was justified and in order?
If not to what relief is he entitled to?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. Both the parties appeared and the management filed the written statement on 15th February, 1980 and the case was fixed for 22nd February, 1980 for filing of rejoinder and framing of issues. On 22nd February, 1980 both the parties prayed for a date for settlement which was granted and the case was fixed for 29th February, 1980. On that day neither the workman nor his authorised representative was present but the management was present. My learned Predecessor passed the *ex parte* order against the workman and the same day the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. Shri V. P. Sharma, Partner of the respondent management stated that the above said workman had left his services of his own accord and his other Partner started his own foundry. This workman was employed by that partner. He further stated that his factory was closed since then and the award was reserved.

On 24th March, 1980 the representative of the workman filed an application for setting aside the *ex parte* order which was set aside and the notice was sent to the management for 22nd May, 1980, but the service of notice could not be effected on the management. Then the representative of the workman was directed to file the correct address of the respondent and the case was fixed for 9th July, 1980. On that day none was present from either side. The service of the notice could not be effected on the management as the employer was not available on that new address.

In these circumstances, I feel that the workman had settled his dispute with the management and joined his services in the foundry of other Partner of the respondent Company as stated by Shri V. P. Sharma. The workman is not interested to pursuing his case. I send no dispute award in this reference. No order as to costs. This be read in answer of this award.

Dated 6th November, 1980

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2075, dated 10th November, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12624.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Executive Engineer TG and Piping Erection Division PTPP, Haryana State Electricity Board, Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 306 of 1980

between

SHRI MAHARAJ SINGH NEGI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. EXECUTIVE
ENGINEER, TG AND PIPING ERECTION DIVISION PTPP, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY
BOARD, PANIPAT.

Present :

Shri Karan Singh, for the Workman.
Shri S S Sarohi for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 306 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/KNL/54-80/38869, dated 24th July, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Maharaj Singh, workman and the management of M/s. Executive Engineer TG and Piping Erection Division PTPP, Haryana State Electricity Board, Panipat. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Maharaj Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

The parties put in their appearance in response to the usual notices. It is not necessary to go into the merits of the case, as an amicable settlement had been arrived at between the parties. On 29th October, 1980 the case was fixed for filing of written statement, when the representative of the workman made a statement on oath in this court that the workman had settled his dispute with the management and filed a copy of settlement which is Ex. W1. He further stated that the workman had been taken back on duty by the management and now there is no dispute between the parties. This statement was duly agreed to by the representative of the management.

In view of the statements given by both the parties. I give my award that there is no dispute between the parties as the workman had been taken back on duty by the management. The workman is not entitled to any relief. No order as to costs. This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated the 3rd November, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 2062 the 10th November, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12633.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s K. C. Metal Industries, New Subzi Mandi, Jagadhri:—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 65 of 1979

between

SHRI RAGHBEER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S K. C.
METAL INDUSTRIES, NEW SUBZI MANDI, JAGADHRI

Present.—

Shri Surinder Kumar, for the workman.
Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 65 of 79 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor, —vide his order No. Ymg/21/79/12225, dated 16th March, 1979 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Raghbeer Singh, workman and the management of M/s K. C. Metal Industries, Bahadurgarh. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghbeer Singh was justified and order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared in response to the same on 24th May, 1979, filed their respective pleadings on the basis of which issues were framed on 29th June, 1979 and the case was fixed for evidence of the management to be recorded on 29th August, 1979. After several adjournments for the same the parties arrived at an amicable settlement between themselves. The statement of the authorised representative of the workman has been recorded today on 31st October, 1980.

According to his statement the workman is not interested in his reinstatement or re-employment as he has settled the same with the management. No further adjudication is required and the reference is answered and is returned accordingly. No order as to costs.

Dated 31st October, 1980.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2683, dated 3rd November, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.